

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated February 4, 2009, (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered but are believed to be improper. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(b) rejection because the asserted reference, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0063732 by Mansikkaniemi *et al.* (hereinafter “Mansikkaniemi”), does not teach or suggest each of the claimed limitations. For example, Mansikkaniemi has not been shown to teach or suggest associating calendar notes with calendar profiles where each calendar profile defines a unique view to calendar content on the basis of the calendar notes associated with the calendar profile, as claimed in each of the independent claims. The cited paragraph [0048] of Mansikkaniemi teaches that each new event (an event is asserted as corresponding to the claimed calendar note) is designated to either be listed on the family calendar or just on the individual’s calendar. However, Mansikkaniemi does not mention anything about calendar profiles defining a unique view to calendar content on the basis of the calendar notes associated with a profile as claimed. Rather, Mansikkaniemi only describes a conventional procedure of inputting certain new calendar events to certain calendars (individual or family). The claimed calendar profiles operate similar to user profiles (*see, e.g.*, paragraphs [0017] and [0024]) such that a calendar (*e.g.*, shared family calendar) does not correspond to the claimed profile. Mansikkaniemi only teaches that certain new events can be designated to be shown on the family calendar or on an individual’s calendar but does not teach that a single calendar note will provide a unique (*i.e.* different) view to the calendar content when a selected calendar profile changes. In contrast, the claimed calendar profiles provide unique views of one calendar based upon the notes associated with each profile. This is further illustrated by the lack of correspondence to additional claim limitations discussed below.

Mansikkaniemi also does not disclose the claim limitations directed to selecting in the terminal at least one calendar profile for generating calendar content to be shared. Again paragraph [0048] fails to teach such limitations because it merely teaches that a user

designates an event to be listed on a family calendar or on an individual's calendar. In contrast, the claims require that a calendar profile is first selected in order to then be able to generate the unique view to the calendar content to be shared. Thus, the asserted teachings disclose the opposite, starting with the event and then designating the calendar with which to list the event. Similarly, paragraph [0048] also fails to teach generating the calendar content to be shared on the basis of at least one selected calendar profile, as claimed. In Mansikkaniemi, the generation of the calendar content is not made on the basis of calendar profiles and the notes associated therewith. Instead, each calendar event is generated and added to a calendar by a user.

In addition, Mansikkaniemi does not teach or suggest establishing a connection between the terminal and at least one user terminal for transmitting or loading the calendar content to be shared, as claimed. In Mansikkaniemi, the calendar events are transmitted to a central server which stores both individual and family calendars. Events are added or modified by using a terminal of the system authorizing the access to family calendar services (paragraph [0014]). However, Mansikkaniemi does not teach that the calendar content is shared directly between two user terminals. Without a presentation of correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the § 102(b) rejection is improper.

In order to anticipate a claim the asserted reference must teach every element of the claim. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The Federal Circuit also recently held that “Because the hallmark of anticipation is prior invention, the prior art reference—in order to anticipate under 35 U.S.C. § 102—must not only disclose all elements of the claim within the four corners of the document, but must also disclose those elements ‘arranged as in the claim.’” (Net Moneyin, Inc. v. Verisign, Inc., 545 F.3d 1359, 2008 WL 4614511 (Fed. Cir. 2008) quoting *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 1548 (Fed. Cir. 1983)). Therefore, all claim elements, and their limitations, must be found in the prior art reference to maintain the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 102. Applicant respectfully submits that Mansikkaniemi does not teach every element of

independent Claims 1, 5, 10, and 14 in the requisite detail, and therefore fails to anticipate Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-10, 13, 14, and 17.

Dependent Claims 4, 8, 9, 13, and 17 depend from independent Claims 1, 5, and 10, respectively, and also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Mansikkaniemi. While Applicant does not acquiesce with the particular rejections to these dependent claims, these rejections are also improper for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 5, and 10. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from the cited reference. Therefore, the rejection of dependent Claims 4, 8, 9, 13, and 17 is improper, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With particular respect to the rejection of dependent Claims 4 and 8, Applicant traverses because Mansikkaniemi has not been shown to teach or suggest each of the claimed limitations. The cited portions of Mansikkaniemi do not teach that shared content is generated based on a remote device, user group, purpose of use or time of day. Rather, Mansikkaniemi teaches that shared content is generated by a user. The fact that the content is listed on a family calendar or that the content may be displayed using a day or month view fails to correspond to the claimed generation of the content. Without correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the § 102(b) rejection is improper, and Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (KOL.217.WUS) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC  
8009 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, Suite 125  
Minneapolis, MN 55425  
952.854.2700

Date: May 1, 2009

By: /Erin M. Nichols/

Erin M. Nichols  
Reg. No. 57,125